



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,969	08/30/2001	Kay-Yut Chen	10004567-1	2217
22879 7590 08/26/2009 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration 3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528				
EXAMINER ROBERTSON, DAVID				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2121				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/26/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

ipa.mail@hp.com

jessica.Lfuseck@hp.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/944,969
Filing Date: August 30, 2001
Appellant(s): CHEN, KAY-YUT

Kay-Yut Chen
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 6/8/2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 1/7/2009.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

However the following **New Grounds of Rejection** has been added.

NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION

Claims 1-9, 18-21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 101 (rejection re-instated) based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions.

Claims 10-17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention encompasses non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 2121

Claims 10-17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-9, 18-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on

Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions.

For a process to be patentable subject matter under § 101 the process must (1) be tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform subject matter to a different state or thing. See *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 US 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 US 584, 588 n9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 US 780, 787-88 (1876). If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process. To qualify under § 101 as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

In the present case, none of method (process) claims 1-9 or 18-23 recite a step transforming subject matter to a different state or thing or positively recite a sufficient tie to another statutory class of invention, such as a particular apparatus. Mere recitation of an apparatus or article in the preamble of a claim does not transform an unpatentable process into a patentable process (see *Ex parte Langemyr*, BPAI Appeal 2008-1495, Decided May, 2008), as in for example, the preamble of independent claims 1 and 8 which recite Thus, the invention as claimed is ineligible for patenting and therefore nonstatutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 10-17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention encompasses non-statutory subject matter.

Claims to apparatus without structure and comprising solely software modules unrelated to any computer-readable media or memory encompass computer programs *per se*, which are non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. Further, lacking structure, it is indefinite as to whether claims to an apparatus comprising software modules are product or process claims, and therefore indefinite as to which statutory class the invention belongs, as is indicated in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, below. .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10-17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims to apparatus without structure and comprised solely of software modules unrelated to any computer readable media or memory are indefinite as to which statutory class the invention belongs.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Chaturvedi et al. "Synthetic Economies: The Application of Distributed Interactive Computing Environments for Policy and Management Decision Making", Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA), September 1997.

Chaturvedi and Mehta, "Simulations in economics and management." Communications of the ACM, March 1999.

Honarvar et al. (US Pat. NO. 6,405,173).

Sugges, "The Use of Computerized Business Games to Simulate business Behavior Under Different Policies", IEEE Winter Simulation Conference, 1979.

Fischbacker "z-Tree--Zurich Toolbox for Readymade Economic Experiments - Experimenter's Manual", Institute for Empirical Research in Economics, University of Zurich, September 1999.

Jepsen, "How Programming Languages Evolve", IT Pro, November/December, 1999.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION

Claims 1-9, 18-21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 101 (rejection re-instated) based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions.

Claims 10-17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention encompasses non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 10-17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-9, 18-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on

Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions.

For a process to be patentable subject matter under § 101 the process must (1) be tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform subject matter to a different state or thing. See *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 US 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v Flook*, 437 US 584, 588 n9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 US 780, 787-88 (1876). If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process. To qualify under § 101 as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

In the present case, none of method (process) claims 1-9 or 18-23 recite a step transforming subject matter to a different state or thing or positively recite a sufficient tie to another statutory class of invention, such as a particular apparatus. Mere recitation of an apparatus or article in the preamble of a claim does not transform an unpatentable process into a patentable process (see *Ex parte Langemyr*, BPAI Appeal 2008-1495, Decided May, 2008), as in for example, the preamble of independent claims 1 and 8 which recite Thus, the invention as claimed is ineligible for patenting and therefore nonstatutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 10-17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention encompasses non-statutory subject matter.

Claims to apparatus without structure and comprising solely software modules unrelated to any computer-readable media or memory encompass computer programs *per se*, which are non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. Further, lacking structure, it is indefinite as to whether claims to an apparatus comprising software modules are product or process claims, and therefore indefinite as to which statutory class the invention belongs, as is indicated in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10-17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims to apparatus without structure and comprised solely of software modules unrelated to any computer readable media or memory are indefinite as to which statutory class the invention belongs.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaturvedi et al (with Richard White, "Synthetic Economies: The Application of Distributed Interactive Computing Environments for Policy and Management Decision Making", Institute for Defense Analysis, September 1997, hereinafter "Chaturvedi/IDA"; with Mehta, "Simulations in economics and management. Communication of the ACM, March 1999, hereinafter "Chaturvedi/ACM") and further in view of Honarvar et al (US 6,405,173), Sugges ("The Use of Computerized Business Games to Simulate business Behavior Under Different Policies", IEEE Winter Simulation Conference, 1979), and Fischbacker ("z-Tree--Zurich Toolbox for Readymade Economic Experiments - Experimenter's Manual", Institute for Empirical Research in Economics, University of Zurich, September 1999).

Chaturvedi (/ACM and /IDA) disclose the SEAS (Synthetic Economy for Analysis and Simulation) methods and system developed at Purdue University for interactive modeling and simulation of business policy management and economic behavior, mimicking real-time markets in a laboratory simulation populated by agents human and artificial. Chaturvedi is a named inventor on the patent to Mehta et al (US Pat.

6,931,365) as cited and previous applied but disqualified by Appellant's Declaration of earlier invention under 37 CFR 1.131. *Mehta et al* refers expressly to a "synthetic environment for analysis and simulation," with claims directed to such; however, *Mehta et al* does not explicitly, by name, reference the work of "SEAS". However the strong correlation between the "SEAS" literature cited herein, and the disclosure by *Mehta et al*, there is not sufficient evidence in the patent or application file to construe *Mehta et al* as a detailed "product description" of the earlier disclosed SEAS synthetic environment for analysis and simulation system.

Honarvar discloses automated methods for simulation and analysis of economic outcomes of management decisions to improve profitability and maximize customer value, including analysis and simulation of policy decisions for financial services, telephone utility companies, banks, and other business types. Sugges teaches early recognition in the art for simulating business behavior using computerized games to assess economic impact and behavioral outcomes of players under different business policies and Fischbacker discloses a script-based, customizable, and interactive computerized economic/business gaming tool.

Specifically, with respect to the claims of the instant application:

Claim 1

Chaturvedi teaches defining a plurality of players including an associated set of rules defining a possible decision space (/ACM, page 60: "buyers, sellers, regulators..."); an information set (/ACM, page 60: "customizing the database"); an outcome function and a payoff function which determine the economic impact of the

business policies defined by the rules (/IDA, Appendix A); however, Chaturvedi does not expressly teach rules for players defined by a decision-making process tree; nor does Chaturvedi expressly teach executing the simulation using a scripting language.

It was old and well known in the art of computer programming, specifically logic programming for automated decision-making making systems, to use decision-trees to define rules, the familiar if-then-else programming construct being a form of a decision-tree definition of a rule. Honarvar teaches player (client) rules defined by decision trees (see Figures 6 and 10 and related discussion) defining client strategies for the business simulation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to define rules for players using such means as the decision-tree, readily programmable with a familiar programming construct as this would have provided a flexible and readily programmable means for defining simple or arbitrarily complex rules for the defined players of the economic simulation.

Official Notice is taken as old and well known in the art of computer programming, and specifically in the art of programming for automated economic games simulation, to use a scripting language to define and execute the simulation. Scripting languages generally, have long been known to provide adaptability and ease of implementation for programmers in highly dynamic and customizable programming environments (see page 71, "Script Doctoring" and "Ultimate Adaptability", by Jepsen, "How Programming Languages Evolve", IT Pro, November/December, 1999).

Specifically in the art of the present invention, Sugges teaches computerized *business* games used as a research tool to determine how businesses respond to

corporate and governmental policies in the context of economies, and Fischbacker teaches the use of a scripting language in a customizable, interactive computerized business game. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Chaturvedi as a scripted simulation using the suggestion of Sugges and Fischbacker, as this would have provided a well known means to change the "operating functionality at run-time", i.e. customizability, thereby realizing "dynamically reconfigurable environment" as expressly envisioned by Chaturvedi/ACM (page 60, box column 2, 2nd paragraph).

Claims 2 and 3

Chaturvedi teaches a simulation environment for humans and/or automated agents and, as with the present disclosure, does not restrict its use to exclusively human players (/ACM, page 60).

Claim 4

Chaturvedi teaches modifying the set of rules for one or more players and teaches or suggests repeating steps b) to c) (of the method of claim 1 as above).

Claim 5

Chaturvedi teaches providing calibration data for defined players based on empirical sales information (/ACM, page 60, "calibrating the artificial agents' [the defined players] parameters to match that of the real consumers" implying a calibration from empirical sales information based on consumers).

Claim 6

Chaturvedi teaches a plurality of scenarios defining variations on the set of rules associated with the one or more players (), and generating scripts corresponding to the player definition variations.

Claim 7 and 8

In view of the discussion of scripts above for claim 1, Chaturvedi teaches or suggests dynamically assembled simulations based on participant's profiles or on demand, thereby also suggesting "on-the-fly execution" (i.e. interpreted) scripts.

Claim 9

Chaturvedi expressly teaches rules associated with at least one players defining at least one business policy.

Claims 10-17 recite automated apparatus for carrying out the methods of claims 1-9 and are thus similarly rejected for reasons given above.

Claims 18 -20

Chaturvedi teaches or suggests the elements of claim 1 recited in claim 18 as described above for claim 1, and further Chaturvedi teaches a method of evaluating the actions of a human player within a decision environment with other human and/or automated players, inherently determining the players behavioral outcome (the player's actions) resulting from execution of the "codified script", the outcome measured by costs, profits, etc, i.e. economic states.

Claim 21

Chaturvedi teaches providing calibration data for defined players based on historical data and producing calibration data based on the historical data, wherein the codified script is translated from the definitions and the calibration data (see /ACM, page 60).

Claims 22 and 23 further recite steps of retranslating player definitions into modified scripts and executing the modified strips. Chaturvedi does not expressly teach modifying the player definitions, retranslating, and determining another behavioral outcome. However, these steps recite merely the effect of re-running a simulation with new players (a new plurality of players implies modified player definitions). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that to run a new simulation with new set of players, one would perform the equivalent of retranslating player definitions into modified scripts and executing the modified strips, thereby executing the new simulation with the current players of the economic game.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant argues none the prior art Chaturvedi/ACM or Chaturvedi/IDA, alone or in combination with Fischbacher or Sugges teach or suggest *translating player definitions defining a plurality of players and an associated set of rules into a codified script* as recited in claims 1-9 (App. Br. 6), claims 10-17 (App. Br. 9), and claims 18-23 (App. Br. 10), arguing instead that Chaturvedi/ACM and /IDA and the prior art use only predefined programs and not *scripts translated from player definitions* (App. Br. 6-7).

Examiner respectfully disagrees: The related works of Chaturvedi/ACM and Chaturvedi/IDA were not alone used to teach *translating player definitions from scripts*. Chaturvedi/ACM teaches defining a plurality of players including an associated set of rules defining a possible decision space (see Chaturvedi/ACM, page 60: “buyers, sellers, regulators...”). Fischbacker was used to teach the use of a scripting language in a *customizable, interactive* computerized business game. Sugges was used solely to show that computerized business games are long known to be used as a research tool to determine how businesses respond to corporate and governmental policies in the context of economies, a teaching directly in the art of the invention, and Jepsen was used an authoritative reference to the assertion by Official Notice that scripting languages, generally, have long been known to provide adaptability and ease of implementation for programmers in highly dynamic and customizable programming environments (see page 71, “Script Doctoring” and “Ultimate Adaptability”, by Jepsen, “How Programming Languages Evolve”, IT Pro, November/December, 1999).

Applying a known technique to known device, method, or product that is ready for improvement is obvious if the particular known technique was recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art, who would have been capable of applying this known technique to the known device, method, or product, and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR)*, 550 U.S. ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). MPEP ¶ 2141 [R-6].

In the present case, Chaturvedi provides a known method ready for the improvement of a scripting language as in Fischbacker. Jepsen shows that such

scripting adaptability was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art of programming who would have been capable of implementing scripting in dynamic and customizable programming environments. Therefore, Fischbacker, being one such programming environment directed expressly to simulation for encoding scripts to create a customizable, interactive business game, applied as an improvement to Chaturvedi, would have predictably resulted in the improved and "dynamically reconfigurable environment" as expressly envisioned by Chaturvedi (/ACM, page 60, box, column 2).

The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). The combined teachings of the references clearly suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, that the combination of a scripting language to *translate player definitions defining a plurality of players and an associated set of rules into a codified script* was a known technique recognized by those of ordinary skill at the time of the invention who were capable of its application, and would have predictably resulted in increased flexibility and speed of conducting "large-scale experiments and simulations where interactions among agents (players) need to be studied (Chaturvedi/ACM, page 60, box column 2).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dave Robertson/

Examiner, Art Unit 2121

Conferees:

/Scott L Jarrett/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3624

Mr. Vincent Millin/vm/

Appeals Practice Specialist